NOW COMES Barbara Jeanne Altemeier, Plaintiff, to file this Complaint and would show the Court the following to wit:

I. JURISDICTION

1.) This action is brought pursuant to Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985 (3), Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332; Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343, State Law Claims under Title 28 U.S.C. § 1367 and First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

2.4

II. PARTIES

- 2.) The plaintiff in this case is Barbara Jeanne Altemeier, who is a resident of Orange County, Garden Grove, California whose mailing address is 13861 Yockey Street; Garden Grove, California 92844.
- 3.) Dallas County, Texas (1) is a Defendant domiciled in Dallas County, Texas, whose agent may be served to Judge James Foster, 411 Elm Street, Suite 210, Dallas, Texas 75202.
 - 4.) City of Dallas, Texas (2) is a Defendant domiciled in Dallas County, Texas, whose agent, Thomas Perkins, City Attorney, City of Dallas, may be served to at City Hall, 1500 Marilla Street, 7D North, Dallas, Texas 75201-6390.
 - 5.) Muskegon County, Michigan (3) is a Defendant domiciled in Muskegon County, Michigan, whose agent, Theodore Williams, County Attorney, may be served at 120 West Apple, POB 599, Muskegon, Michigan 49443.
- 6.) Fruitport Township, Michigan (4) is a Defendant

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 3 of 39 PageID 3

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

- domiciled in Muskegon County, Michigan whose agent may be served to Ronald Bultje, City Attorney, 101 N. 3rd Street, Grand Haven, Michigan 49417-1209.
- 7.) Defendant James Schultz (5) is a resident of Muskegon 5 County, whose employment address is 5825 Airline Road, 6 Fruitport, Michigan 49415-9708.
 - Defendant Tony Tague (6) is a resident of Muskegon 8.) County, whose employment address is 990 Terrace Street, 5th Floor, Muskegon, Michigan 49442-3497.
- Defendant Dale J. Hilson (7) is a resident of Muskegon 10 County, whose employment address is 990 Terrace Street, 5th 11 12 Floor, Muskegon, Michigan 49442-3497.
- 13 10.) Defendant Louis Canales (8) is a resident of Dallas County, whose employment address is 9915 E. 14 NW Highway, Dallas, Texas 75238. 15
 - 11.) Defendant Ronald M. Hubner (9) is a resident of Dallas County, whose employment address is 9915 E. NW Highway, Dallas, Texas 75238.
 - 12.) Defendant Daniel Downs (10) is a resident of Dallas County, whose last known employment address is 111 West Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas 75208.
- 13.) Defendant Ronald Anderson (11) is a resident of Dallas 22 County, whose employment address is 5201 Harry Hines Blvd., 23 Dallas, Texas 75235. 24
- 14.) Defendant Lupe Valdez (12) is a resident of Dallas 25

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 4 of 39 PageID 4

- County, whose employment address is 111 West Commerce Street,
 Dallas, Texas 75208.
 - 15.) Defendant Parkland Health & Hospital System Auxiliary (13) is a Defendant, whose agent, Michael Silhol c/o Legal Affairs, may be served at 5201 Harry Hines Blvd., Dallas, Texas 75235.

7

8

3

4

5

6

III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Preamble

- The purpose of this Statement of the Case is to inform the Court of a number of serious crimes that have been committed against Plaintiff by certain individuals within the following organizational units: the Fruitport Township Police Department, Fruitport, Michigan; Muskegon County Prosecutor's Office, Muskegon, Michigan; the Dallas County Police Department, Dallas, Texas; the staff of the Dallas County Jail, Dallas Texas; Parkland Health Hospital System Auxiliary, Dallas, Texas; and other named Defendants.
- 17.) Plaintiff has had medical problems since her birth in 1951. Plaintiff has been diagnosed with an autonomic nervous system dysfunction and sensitivities to various petrochemicals. Plaintiff's doctors orders require her to drink prescription bottled water and eat prescription organic food. Many doctors who specialize in Plaintiff's condition know her case around the world.

18.) The facts are as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1. On October 17, 2006, Plaintiff was arrested in Dallas, Texas without a warrant. The incarceration lasted until January 2, 2007 a total of 78 days.
- 2. Defendant Officer Schultz, is a detective of the Fruitport Township Police Department, Fruitport, Michigan, who falsely made up the felony complaint.
- 3. There was no warrant at the time of the arrest. Only after Plaintiff was arrested in Dallas, Texas, did Officer James Schultz and the Muskegon County Prosecutor request a felony warrant from the 60th District Court, Muskegon, Michigan. As a result, a 1: EMBEZZELMENT--FROM felony warrant, count Α VULNERABLE ADULT--\$20,000 OR MORE was issued.
- 4. However, there was never any crime of theft committed against the alleged victim by the Plaintiff.
- 5. After a two (2) year ordeal that almost cost Plaintiff her life and by which Plaintiff incurred substantial legal expenses, Plaintiff was cleared of all charges with the kind assistance of the alleged victim. Motion for nolle prosequi was granted, and the case was dismissed without prejudice, on November 10, 2008.
- 6. The Defendant arresting officers in the City of Dallas, Texas, Officer Louis Canales and Officer

Ronald M. Hubner, arrested Plaintiff on a warrantless arrest.

3

4

7. On the day of the arrest, the outside temperature was over 85 degrees Fahrenheit. Without prescription bottled water, the Plaintiff rapidly dehydrated.

5

Subsequently, the arresting officers adamantly

7

refused to allow Plaintiff's prescription organic

8

food or prescription bottled water to accompany her

9

when she was transported to the Dallas County Jail.

10

8. When Plaintiff first arrived at the jail, a woman of

11

apparent authority was walking around spraying a can

12

containing a noxious substance. While spraying all around the room, the woman sprayed some of the

13 14

substance directly in Plaintiff's face from a

15

distance of approximately 6 inches. This caused

16

Plaintiff to have an immediate, serious reaction;

17

Plaintiff fell to the floor and never regained the

18

use of her legs for the entire time she was in the

19

Plaintiff was placed in a wheelchair every time she

21

20

was moved from place to place. Then the wheelchair

22

was removed from the cell each time, leaving the

23

plaintiff immobile. It took weeks of repeatedly

24

requesting the wheelchair be left in the cell to have

25

this request granted.

jail.

9.

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 7 of 39 PageID 7

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 10. At the beginning of Plaintiff's incarceration, informed jail staff her the of medical condition/handicapped status. She also informed the jail staff that she required prescription organic food and prescription bottled water. During the booking process, both of these were not noted/written When Plaintiff attempted to write on the down. sheet, the sheet was taken away. Plaintiff ignored, and some personnel even laughed at Plaintiff's request. Plaintiff had no way of getting the prescription organic food or the prescription bottled water her well established medical needs required.
- 11. Plaintiff was taken via wheelchair to an area called "the infirmary." On the way to the nurses' station, within the confines of the infirmary, Plaintiff was wheeled past buckets containing chemicals used for cleaning, which resulted in Plaintiff passing out upon arrival at the nurses' station. On October 19th, 2006, Plaintiff regained consciousness while still in the jail and was transported to Parkland Health & Hospital System Auxiliary. Plaintiff informed the doctor that she had not received any prescription organic food or any prescription bottled water, which her medical condition required. The doctor then

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 8 of 39 PageID 8

1 allowed Plaintiff's sister, Joan Magnuson, to bring 2 to the Plaintiff the prescription bottled water. 3 doctor asked Joan Magnuson to also bring in the 4 prescription food, but Joan Magnuson did not have any 5 prescription food available at the time, so he told 6 her to go out and get it and bring it back to the 7 Joan Magnuson's return hospital. Upon 8 hospital, she discovered there was a shift change and 9 the doctor who sent her for the prescription organic 10 food was now gone. The new doctor, Dr. Charles Todd, flatly refused to allow Joan Magnuson to give the 12 Plaintiff her prescription organic food. 13 result, Joan Magnuson showed Dr. Todd a letter from Dr. Alfred Johnson, who had been Plaintiff's primary physician for over 15 years, outlining Plaintiff's 15 medical requirements, including Plaintiff's 16 prescription for organic food and prescription bottled water. Dr. Charles Todd chose to ignore Dr. Alfred Johnson's instructions and even refused to 19 allow Joan Magnuson to give the food to a third party that could then in turn give the Plaintiff prescription organic food. From that point forward, doctors involved with the Plaintiff 23 emergency room, allowed her to keep the prescription bottled water, but did not give Plaintiff any food. 25

11

14

17

18

20

21

22

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 9 of 39 PageID 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When Plaintiff returned to the jail, she was wheeled past the same type buckets containing chemicals used for cleaning, causing the Plaintiff to black out again, as she arrived at the same nurses' station. This time, the staff shoved smelling salts Plaintiff's nose with great force, because Plaintiffs' nostrils full were of blood when Plaintiff regained consciousness. Then, on October 20th, 2006, Plaintiff was transported via ambulance, back to Parkland Health & Hospital System Auxiliary, where Plaintiff was treated against her will and against her doctor's (Dr. Alfred Johnson) written orders, which the emergency room doctors had in their possession.

- 12. Later on October 20th, 2006, Plaintiff was sent back to jail. This time Plaintiff was placed in solitary confinement on an approximately three (3) foot high concrete slab. The wheel chair was removed from the room.
- 13. Note: Jails accommodate other dietary needs, such as diabetic, vegetarian, Muslim, Jewish, etc. Plaintiff was allowed to have her prescription bottled water after the hospital incident. The prescription bottled water had to be supplied by the Plaintiff's sister, Joan Magnuson, who flew in from California.

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 10 of 39 PageID 10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

However, Plaintiff's prescription dietary needs were not addressed. For more than a week, before the hospital, during the hospital stay, and after returning to jail, Plaintiff was only offered jail food twice in the Dallas County Jail. Other than that, Plaintiff was not offered any food, nor were her dietary needs met. At meal times, a guard pushing the food cart, would park it in front of the door, in plain view of the Plaintiff. inmates would place a food tray through each door. Then, an inmate would ask the guard why the opening to the Plaintiff's cell door was closed. A quard would respond, pointing, laughing, something like, "That's Miss Organic. She doesn't eat our food." Then they would finally move the Plaintiff considers this to be physical and psychological abuse, as well as torture.

- 14. A hearing was held on October 25, 2006. The world famous doctor and author Dr. Doris Rapp flew in from Arizona for this hearing. The judge allowed Dr. Rapp to examine Plaintiff. Dr. Rapp confirmed that, in fact, Plaintiff was unable to stand up and walk.
- 15. Plaintiff could still not walk, and without a wheel chair, could not even get to the toilet. Plaintiff did have a throw-up pail from the hospital, so she

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 11 of 39 PageID 11

succumbed to using it as a toilet. When the pail became full, Plaintiff cried out for help and was ignored. Plaintiff finally had no choice but to toss the contents toward the toilet. Some of the waste reached the toilet; the rest splashed onto the toilet, floor, and walls. Eventually an inmate came to clean the toilet and floors, but the walls were never cleaned, and the stench got so intense that people would hold their noses whenever they came into the cell. For several weeks, Plaintiff had no access to shower facilities. There were never any grab bars for shower or toilet.

- 16. During the first day in solitary confinement,
 Plaintiff noticed that she was being ignored.
- 17. Jail staff did not respond to calls for help, perhaps because they were busy playing card games and slot machines on the jail's computers. When playing the slot machines, a bell would ring and the girl sitting at the computer would say, "I won, I won," or "You won." A guard/staff would play for another guard/staff if that guard was too busy to play for herself. Plaintiff knows this to be true because Plaintiff would witness it during the various times she was wheeled past those computers on the way to the nurses' station. Plaintiff wonders if they were

gambling illegally.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

18. Only after several days following Plaintiff's return to the Dallas County Jail from the second hospital Plaintiff's prescription dietary food visit was eventually allowed into the jail. However, Plaintiff was discriminated against from the first meal because she was only allowed 20 minutes to eat and she was never allowed to take food back to the cell. All Plaintiff's prescription food and prescription bottled water was provided by Plaintiff's sister, like in a third world country. Plaintiff's sister is willing to testify that she and the Plaintiff were verbally abused by the jailers and were treated without dignity or respect. Others who visited the Plaintiff are willing to testify to this abusive treatment.

19. Just before Christmas, jail staff told Plaintiff's sister that there was too much of Plaintiff's food in the facility and therefore would not allow a drop-off of food for Plaintiff. On Christmas Day, Plaintiff received only one five (5) ounce box of organic crackers that was to last the entire day. Plaintiff ate a few organic crackers, and then the nurse took away the box. The same box was brought back at the next meal time. No other food was provided to

Plaintiff. Other inmates on Christmas Day ate chicken, cake, etc. This was cruel and unusual punishment.

21. On December 20, 2006, Plaintiff was called to court regarding EXTRADITION. Judge Patterson said,

"The TERMS OF THE WAIVER OF EXTRADITON FORM, which you execute, I will sign also, provide that the STATE OF MICHIGAN has ten (10) days from the date of execution of this document to either have extradited you or if they fail to do so, then I will ORDER you released from custody;..."

Judge Patterson continued,

"What I'm saying is that ten days from today, you will actually be in Michigan OR released — ten days from today — you will be released from the Dallas County Jail, one way or the other. Either they pick you up and take you to Michigan or they haven't and I ORDER you released from custody; so do you want to sign the waiver?"

After that, Plaintiff signed the extradition paper. Instead of Plaintiff being released on December 30, 2006, the Plaintiff was not released until January 2, 2007, in violation of the Judge's verbal order.

21. When Plaintiff left the jail, Plaintiff spoke with

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 14 of 39 PageID 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

her attorney in Michigan, Christopher Yates (now a judge), who informed Plaintiff that the warrant for her arrest in Muskegon County was still active. Не also informed Plaintiff that, according to Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor, D.J. Hilson of Muskegon Prosecutor's Office the in Muskegon, if Plaintiff turned herself in to Michigan, Muskegon, Michigan jail, the jail staff would not allow Plaintiff to have her prescription organic food and prescription bottled water. Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor Hilson requested Plaintiff's doctors stop sending medical letters regarding her needs and conditions to the Muskegon Prosecutor's Office, and Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor Hilson said the jail staff would send Plaintiff to their own doctor. Note: There was not a single, qualified doctor familiar with Plaintiff's type of medical condition in the whole of Muskegon County, Michigan. After the treatment received at the Dallas County Jail, Plaintiff was afraid that she could receive the same or worse treatment. Translation: Plaintiff could die as a result. Within a week or so of Plaintiff's being released Dallas County Jail, a television news from the broadcast reported that a nineteen (19) year old

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 15 of 39 PageID 15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

schizophrenic was placed in solitary confinement at the Detroit, Michigan jail, was not given any food or water, and died on the fourth day. Plaintiff chose not to be murdered in this way and went into hiding for about twenty-three (23) months. Plaintiff could not even prove her innocence if taken to jail because it isn't likely that Plaintiff would live long enough prescription organic food without her and prescription bottled water to make an appearance before a judge. The Assistant Muskegon Prosecutor, Dale J. Hilson, kept offering Plaintiff plea bargains through her attorney. If Plaintiff accepted some nebulous misdemeanor charge, then Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor Hilson would accept time served. So, Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor Hilson kept trying to force Plaintiff to accept a plea bargain through her attorney, which Plaintiff would have no part. There was never a crime in the first place, but Assistant Muskegon Country Prosecutor, Dale J. Hilson, wanted to convict Plaintiff of yet another crime she did not commit.

22. For the next twenty-three (23) months, Plaintiff was forced to be a fugitive because Muskegon County Prosecutor Tony Tague and Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor Dale J. Hilson were operating under color

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of law by maintaining an active arrest warrant for Plaintiff when they had been noticed and knew that no crime had been committed.

23. Around September 2008, Mr. Leland Earnest Davis (the alleged victim) discovered that these false charges had never been dropped. According to documents, Mr. Davis called the Muskegon County Prosecutor's Office and finally talked to the Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor, Dale J. Hilson. The alleged victim, Mr. Davis, asked Assistant Muskegon County Prosecutor Mr. Hilson to drop the charges, since there was never any crime in the first place. Mr. Davis also sent a follow-up letter. Still nothing happened. So, Mr. Davis wrote another letter to the Muskegon County Prosecutor, Tony Tague. Still nothing happened. Note: The Prosecutor's Office is on the 5th Floor of the Court House Building. As Plaintiff understands it, Muskegon County Prosecutor Tony Tague was up for election and would reach his twenty (20) years to be for retirement if he won the election. vested Instead of dropping the charges on an innocent person, he chose to not drop the charges until after the election was over, perhaps to avoid any negative Plaintiff's output on his campaign. In Note: opinion, her civil rights as a qualified American

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 17 of 39 PageID 17

voter in the national election were knowingly and willfully taken away by Muskegon County Prosecutor Tony Tague for his own benefit and gain. Plaintiff was unable to let the public know prior to his election what Muskegon County Prosecutor Tony Tague had done.

- 19.) These are only a few of the incidents that happened. There are many, many more instances where the Plaintiff and others were tortured and laws were knowingly broken. If Plaintiff listed all the instances, she would have to write a book. The Plaintiff is still traumatized to date because of the acts of the Defendants.
- 20.) No human being should be treated like the Plaintiff was treated in this case just because she was different. Not even in a third-world country, where rights may not even exist, should we ever close even one eye to such atrocities. Where are the rights of the accused, and especially, where are the rights of the wrongly accused?
- 21.) Plaintiff has issued proper paperwork requesting copies of all information pertaining to this case from the jail. What Plaintiff received in return was woefully incomplete. The county said they find no record of Plaintiff being charged or convicted of a felony in Dallas County, Texas since 1973.
- 22.) The Defendants in this case deprived the Plaintiff of federal rights and acted under color of state law and federal

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 18 of 39 PageID 18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

25.)

law, which are violations of Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985. The Defendants have acted in bad faith and have employed the means outlined in the Complaint as a means of harassing the The Defendants who are not state officers used Plaintiff. state law, court proceedings and judgments in the overt acts listed in the counts of the Complaint along with assistance from state and local government officials to make their action a joint participation in state action under color of law. The Defendants conspired for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any state or territory, with intent to deny the Plaintiff the equal protection of the laws, or to injure her for lawfully enforcing or attempting to enforce, the right of the Plaintiff to equal protection of the laws. The Defendants conspired to go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, the Plaintiff, of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; whereby, the Plaintiff is injured in her person or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States; the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators.

Some of the Defendants formed a conspiracy from the

beginning, and the other Defendants joined the conspiracy as the events occurred in time.

26.) Plaintiff asks for attorney's fees in accordance with Title 42 U.S.C. § 1988 (b). Plaintiff seeks compensation for all the expenses incurred and for the indignities, horrendous horrors, terrorism, atrocities and torture she suffered personally and for the nightmare of watching others suffer cruel and inhumane treatment. Plaintiff continues to suffer post-release, post-traumatic stress syndrome, continues to experience horrible nightmares and severe consequences to this late date.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

- 27.) Defendant Dallas County, Texas (1) is the entity that maintains, owns and controls the Dallas County Jail that illegally held the Plaintiff in custody against her will.
- 28.) Defendant City of Dallas, Texas (2) is the entity that controls and maintains the City of Dallas Police Department which at the time of the arrest illegally arrested and held Plaintiff without a Texas arrest warrant or a Michigan arrest warrant.
- 29.) Defendant Muskegon County, Michigan (3) is the entity that employs and administers the county prosecutor's office from which a county prosecutor filed a bogus, and improper criminal complaint against Plaintiff.

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 20 of 39 PageID 20

- 30.) Defendant Fruitport Township, Michigan (4) is the entity that controls and maintains the Fruitport Township Police Department which investigated and filed bogus criminal charges against the Plaintiff.
- 31.) Defendant James Schultz (5) is a detective and police officer for the Fruitport Township Police Department, in Fruitport Township, Michigan, who investigated and bought bogus charges against Plaintiff without probable cause.
- 32.) Defendant Tony Tague (6) is a Muskegon County prosecutor who caused to be issued a bogus Michigan arrest warrant after Plaintiff was arrested in Texas without probable cause and refused to drop the warrant and have the case dismissed in a timely manner..
- 33.) Defendant Dale J. Hilson (7) is a Muskegon County prosecutor, who refused to drop warrant and charges after receiving testimony from the alleged victim who stated he was not missing any of his money. Defendant Hilson also ignored legal notices from Plaintiff's attorney outlining reasons for dismissing warrant and related charges.
- 34.) Defendant Louis Canales (8) is a City of Dallas police officer who illegally arrested Plaintiff without a Texas or Michigan arrest warrant and with no explanation of the arrest or statement of the charge. Also, no Miranda rights were read to the Plaintiff.
- 35.) Defendant Ronald M. Hubner (9) is a City of Dallas

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 21 of 39 PageID 21

- police officer who illegally arrested Plaintiff without a Texas or Michigan arrest warrant and with no explanation of the arrest or statement of the charge. Also, no Miranda rights were read to the Plaintiff.
- 36.) Defendant Daniel Downs (10) is the Chief/Warden of the Dallas County, Texas jail who was aware of the inhumane and bad conditions at the jail; the inhumane and wrongful treatment of the Plaintiff; and inadequate medical care.
- 37.) Defendant Ronald Anderson (11) is the President/Chief Executive Officer of the Parkland Health & Hospital System Auxiliary and is the person who received the requests for the special needs of medical care, prescription organic food, prescription bottled water, and handicap facilities for the Plaintiff from various sources without adequate response.
- 38.) Defendant Lupe Valdez (12) is the Dallas County Sheriff who was aware of the inhumane and bad conditions at the jail; and the inhumane and wrongful treatment of the Plaintiff; inadequate medical care; and failed to release Plaintiff from the Dallas County Jail, after expiration of the extradition order, in a timely manner.
- 39.) Defendant Parkland Health & Hospital System Auxiliary (13) was hired and retained by the Dallas County jail to furnish legal, proper and adequate medical treatment and assistance to Dallas County jail inmates. This was not accomplished for the Plaintiff as outlined in this Complaint.

V. COMPLAINT

40.) The Statement of the Case and Statement of Facts is incorporated in each of the following counts:

Count I

41.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12) and (13) failed to provide adequate medical care in compliance with Constitutional requirements for the Plaintiff at the Dallas County Jail, Dallas, Texas, hereinafter referred to as DCJ.

Count II

.9

42.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12), and (13) failed to adequately identify the health needs through appropriate intake screening, thereby preventing Plaintiff from receiving adequate care of medical needs at the DCJ.

Count III

43.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12) and (13) failed to provide adequate acute and chronic care for the urgent medical needs; thereby, significantly delaying appropriate medical care for the Plaintiff at the DCJ; thereby, creating a lifethreatening situation.

Count IV

44.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12) and (13) failed to provide adequate follow-up treatment for the Plaintiff at the DCJ during incarceration and after discharge.

Count V

45.) The Defendants (11) and (13). intentionally ignored

medical requests that were generated from Plaintiff resulting in denials of necessary medical care at the DCJ.

Count VI

46.) The Defendants (11) and (13) failed to adequately document and execute relevant medical and discharge orders, records and documents concerning the Plaintiff at the DCJ.

Count VII

47.) The Defendants (11) and (13) failed to provide adequate and minimum food, creating conditions that were extremely inhumane and barbaric in violation of the 8th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution at Parkland Health & Hospital System Auxiliary.

Count VIII

48.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12) and (13) failed to provide adequate medical facilities with reasonable space and sanitation, cleanliness, and supervision concerning the Plaintiff at the DCJ.

Count IX

49.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12) and (13) failed to maintain adequate staffing, training, and supervision of the medical and custody staff concerning the Plaintiff at the DCJ.

Count X

50.) The Defendants (1), (10), (11), (12) and (13) failed to engage effective quality assurance review to track violation

incidents concerning the Plaintiff at the DCJ.

Count XI

51.) The Defendants (1), (10) and (12) failed to provide adequate and minimum food, clothing and shelter creating conditions that were extremely inhumane and barbaric in violation of the 8th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution at the DCJ.

Count XII

52.) The Defendants (1), (10) and (12) did not provide adequate protection from biohazards and openly displayed their lack of environmental control concerning the Plaintiff at the DCJ.

Count XIII

53.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13) have accomplished their actions against Plaintiff by causing Plaintiff to suffer loss of liberty, to endure financial loss and to endure hardships that continue to haunt Plaintiff day and night.

Count XIV

54.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) conspired amongst themselves and with other persons or entities to willfully, unlawfully and knowingly violate the Plaintiff's liberty, including the other offenses in the remaining Counts by depriving the Plaintiff of her freedom.

Count XV

55.) All of the Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) jointly and severally have conspired to unfairly and in bad faith illegally take and deprive said liberty from Plaintiff in violation of due process of law and equal protection under color of law. The unlawful scheme on the part of the Defendants was to willfully cause the said liberty to be taken without due process of law.

Count XVI

56.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) (10), (11), (12) and (13) being two or more persons

conspired for the purpose of depriving, directly or indirectly, the Plaintiff of her equal protection of the laws

as well as the equal privileges and immunities under the law

including the 4^{th} , 5^{th} , 8^{th} and 14^{th} Amendments of the U.S.

Constitution of the rights concerning due process of law and equal protection under the law.

Count XVII

57.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13) violated Title 42 \$ 1983 by discriminating against the Plaintiff. The Defendants/conspirators were motivated, did or caused to be accomplished, the acts outlined in this Original Complaint in furtherance of the conspiracy to violate Plaintiff's right to free exercise of rights under the liberty clause of the 5^{th}

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 26 of 39 PageID 26

Amendment, all of which were terminated by and through Defendants' actions, threats and intimidation, creating a chilling effect against the Plaintiff, who is a class of Citizen of the United States of America.

Count XVIII

58.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) intentionally and illegally committed the overt actions and offenses, outlined in the Statement of the Facts which are incorporated in this Count, by interfering with the free exercise of the Plaintiff's rights involving criminal violations of Title 18 U.S.C. § 241. The Defendants conspired to and did injure, oppress, threaten and intimidate the Plaintiff in the free exercise or enjoyment of the rights and privileges secured to the Plaintiff by the 1st, 5th, 8th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Count XIX

59.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) intentionally and illegally committed the overt actions and offenses, outlined in the Statement of the Case which is incorporated in this Count, by interfering with the free exercise of the Plaintiff's rights involving the right not to be falsely and illegally libeled and slandered. The Defendants injured the Plaintiff's reputation and exposed the Plaintiff to public hatred, contempt, and ridicule and impeached the Plaintiff's honesty, integrity, virtue, and

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 27 of 39 PageID 27

reputation and made public the untrue defect of the Plaintiff and thereby exposed the Plaintiff to public hatred, ridicule, and financial injury concerning her good name.

Count XX

60.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) with/without others, willfully and knowingly encouraged, inflamed the passions and prejudices, enticed and coerced relatives, etc., former and present associates to testify and make statements against Plaintiff with misrepresentations, false and perjured declarations when, in fact, said associates may have had only grievances and self-interests not related to the jurisdictional criminal investigations against Plaintiff.

Count XXI

61.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) caused the Plaintiff to be under an illegal jurisdiction, venue and authority when, in fact, the original alleged violations were fatally defective and did not even exist due to several missing essential legal and factual elements and overcharging in violation of due process and equal protection under the law.

Count XXII

62.) All of the Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) discriminated against Plaintiff in violating her due process of law and equal protection under

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 28 of 39 PageID 28

the law, both individually and in combined conspiracy among themselves. The Defendants had an improper ulterior motive for the discrimination.

Count XXIII

63.) All of the Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) were only concerned with sick injustice, prejudice and unfairness administered to the Plaintiff through their horrific acts, words and deeds, in violation of due process of law and equal protection under the law.

Count XXIV

64.) All of the Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) violated and deprived the Plaintiff of liberty concerning the right to be left alone without interference and harassment under the liberty clause of due process in the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and are continuing to deprive Plaintiff of liberty under the liberty clause of due process in the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution causing the Plaintiff to experience undue difficulty and expense in protecting her interests.

Count XXV

65.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) have continually exercised bad faith in prosecuting the Plaintiff by refusing to honor or follow established statutes, regulations and legal principles of law, which has

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 29 of 39 PageID 29

resulted in severe intent to cause harassment. The Plaintiff has suffered irreparable damages, as a result that is both great and immediate. This characterizes official lawlessness.

Count XXVI

and (9) interpretational use of the Michigan and Texas

Judicial Procedures constituted a deprivation of

constitutional rights under the color of state law.

Count XXVII

67.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) have conspired among themselves and with other persons or entities to willfully, unlawfully and knowingly violate the liberty and well-being rights of Plaintiff by depriving the Plaintiff the use and benefit of her liberty and well-being. Some of the defendants not directly involved have participated in the conspiracy by aiding and abetting the principle conspirators.

Count XXVIII

68.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13) entered into agreements to carry out the scheme of an enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity to deprive and defraud the Plaintiff of her liberty and well-being as outlined in the Counts by use of the mails or wires in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 30 of 39 PageID 30

1343. The Defendants devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud or obtain criminal charges by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises for the purpose of executing the scheme or artifice or attempting to do so by utilizing the U.S. Mail, private or commercial interstate carriers, telephone, fax, email or other methods. The Defendants also criminally violated Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242 by willfully, knowingly and unlawfully violating the Plaintiff's civil and constitutional rights. These acts are all in violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) under Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-68 (1994) or more specifically Title 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (c) and (d). These RICO acts began occurring more than one (1) year in the past.

Count XXIX

69.) All of the Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) jointly and severally have conspired to unfairly and in bad faith illegally take and deprive said liberty and well being from Plaintiff in violation of due process of law and equal protection under color of law.

Count XXX

70.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12), being two or more persons, conspired for the purpose of depriving, directly or indirectly, the Plaintiff of her equal protection of the laws, as well as the

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 31 of 39 PageID 31

equal privileges and immunities under the law, including the $4^{\rm th}$, $5^{\rm th}$ and $14^{\rm th}$ Amendments of the U.S. Constitution of the rights concerning due process of law and equal protection under the law.

Count XXXI

71.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) violated Title 42 § 1985 (3) by discriminating against a class or class of persons, being the Plaintiff. The Defendants/conspirators were motivated, did or caused to be accomplished the acts outlined in the Original Complaint in furtherance of the conspiracy to violate Plaintiff's right to free exercise of rights under the liberty clause of the 5th Amendment, all of which were terminated by and though Defendants' actions, threats and intimidation, creating a chilling effect against the Plaintiff, who is a class of citizen of the Untied States of America.

Count XXXII

72.) The Defendants (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) conspired collectively to cause false, erroneous and illegal criminal charges and arrest against the Plaintiff.

Count XXXIII

73.) The Defendants (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) conspired collectively to cause false, erroneous and bogus criminal charges and arrest without a supporting affidavit by Defendants.

Count XXXIV

74.) The Defendants (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) conspired collectively, in agreement to protect their own interests by perjuring themselves while testifying against Plaintiff.

Count XXXV

75.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) charged the plaintiff with a criminal felony without any credible evidence or probable cause and without an official charging instrument.

Count XXXVI

76.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) arrested and arraigned the plaintiff without a proper arrest warrant and probable cause affidavit.

Count XXXVII

77.) The Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) confined plaintiff to jail without a probable cause charging instrument, arrest warrant and without a probable cause affidavit.

Count XXXVIII

78.) The Defendants (1), (10) and (12) failed to release the plaintiff from the DCJ, even after a judge's verbal release order that was very specific as to day and time.

V. CONCLUSION

79.) Therefore, due to the severe harassment, intimidation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and illegal overt acts against the Plaintiff, Plaintiff has endured and suffered great harm in legal costs, expenditure of vast amounts of her time, loss of reputation, loss of liberty and property, and loss of due process of law and equal protection of the law outside of a legitimate government interest, which was/is totally unwarranted.

VI. DAMAGES

The Plaintiff asks this Court for a judgment in her 80.) favor with actual damages of one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) from each Defendant per count. The Plaintiff also asks for four million dollars (\$4,000,000.00) in punitive damages from each Defendant per count. The Plaintiff does not seek damages from the public (federal or state) treasury, but solely from individual funds of the Defendants, except for Defendants (1), (2), (3), (4) and (13).

81.) Due to the fact that the Defendants may be unable or unwilling to pay for said damages in cash, Plaintiff requests that any and all personal and real assets be the subject matter for damages, which would include, but is not limited to, any and all real property, stocks, bonds, vehicles, certificates of deposits, money market accounts, equipment, furniture, jewelry, boats, retirement funds of any type, insurance, sporting equipment, etc. Therefore, the Defendants' real and personal properties be subject to a Notice of Lis Pendens prohibiting the sale or disposition of

Case	3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 34 of 39 PageID 34									
1	said property until a final disposition of this cause of									
2	action.									
3										
4	Respectively submitted,									
5										
6	Rarbara Dannes all Monsion									
7	Barbara Jeanne Altemeier, Pro Se									
8	13861 Yockey Street Garden Grove, California 92844									
9	(714) 379-9557									
10										
11										
12										
13										
14	VERIFICATION									
15										
16	IT IS HEREBY Verified that under the penalties of perjury									
17	that the foregoing Complaint is true and correct to the best									
18	of my knowledge and belief.									
19										
20	Witness my hand and seal this 3rd day of November, 2010.									
21										
22	Barbon Lanna Matherina									
23	Barbara Jeanne Altemeier									
24										

Case 3:10 LCV-02646-NES-BIRT DSTUTOURT, CENTRAL PISTAL PIS

		CIVIE CO	VER SHEET					
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box BARBARA JEANNE AI	DEFENDANTS DALLAS COUNTY	, TEXAS (1),	et al.		-			
yourself, provide same.) BARBARA JEANNE AL	ldress and Telephone Number. If y TEMEIER, Pro se I, GARDEN GROVE, CA 92844-		Attorneys (If Known) Not Known					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	N (Place an X in one box only.)	III. CITIZE	NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL I	PARTIES - F	or Diversity Cases	Only		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		x X in one box for plaintiff	and one for de	ifendant.) Incorporated or Proof Business in this	-		DEF □ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	d □ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citize of Parties in Item III)				Incorporated and of Business in An			▼ 5
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in on	e box only.)	Chizen or Sut	eject of a Foreign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
1 Original 2 Remove State Co		□ 4 Reinstated or □ Reopened	3 Transferred from anoth	er district (spe	ecify): □6 Multi Distri Litiga	ict Judg	eal to Di ge from gistrate J	
V. REQUESTED IN COMPL CLASS ACTION under F.R.C	AINT: JURY DEMAND: DY .P. 23: DYes No		es' only if demanded in cor MONEY DEMANDED		INT: \$ Total Act	ual & Punitive	: Dama	ges
•	e the U.S. Civil Statute under whic U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985 (3); Tort A					tutes unless div	ersity.)	
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Plac			·					
OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Act 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Info. Act	CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	TORTS PERSONAL INJUI □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Productiability □ 320 Assault, Libel Slander □ 330 Fed. Employe Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Productiability □ 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury □ 365 Personal Injury Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Product Liability □ 369 Asterior Application □ 461 Asterior Application □ 463 Habeas Corpu Alien Detaine □ 465 Other Immigra Actions	PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Len 380 Other Person Property Dan Product Liab BANKRUPTC 422 Appeal 28 U 158 423 Withdrawal USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/Accommodations 445 American with Disabilities Disabilities Other 440 Other Civil Rights Civil Civil		Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus General Death Penalty Mandamus/ Other Civil Rights Prison Condition RFEITURE / PENALTY Agriculture Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck Airline Regs Occupational Safety /Health Other	TAB	Agmt. Agmt. Agmt. Agmt. Agmt. Agmt. Agmt. Agmt. Act / Labor on Ret. Inc. / Act / RIGH' ghts ark ECURIT 395ff) ung (92 DIWW)) itle XVI 55(g)) AX SUI U.S. Pla ndant) ird Party	Act TS 3) ITS intiff
			.					

SACV10-1692 JVS(AGR)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: ______

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pro	eviously filed in this court a	nd dismissed, remanded or closed? ☑ No ☐ Yes			
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	e any cases been pre	viously filed in this court the	at are related to the present case? ♥No □ Yes			
□ C. 1	Arise from the same Call for determination For other reasons we	e or closely related transaction of the same or substantial ould entail substantial duplic	ons, happenings, or events; or Ily related or similar questions of law and fact; or cation of labor if heard by different judges; or t, <u>and</u> one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.			
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	following informati	ion, use an additional sheet i	if necessary.)			
			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. It this box is checked, go to item (b).			
County in this District:*	•	-	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Orange County			N/A			
(b) List the County in this District; Check here if the government, it	California County of sagencies or emplo	utside of this District; State yees is a named defendant.	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
N/A			Dallas County, Texas or Muskegon County, Michigan			
(c) List the County in this District; (Note: In land condemnation ca			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.			
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
N/A			Dallas County, Texas or Muskegon County, Michigan			
or other papers as required by lay	e the location of the OR PRO PER): e CV-71 (JS-44) Ci v. This form, approv	riact of land involved Living Jean Avil Cover Sheet and the informed by the Judicial Conference	San Luis Obispo Counties The Consension of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed thing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	cial Security Cases:					
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	of Cause of Action			
861 HIA All claims for health in Also, include claims by program. (42 U.S.C. 19			rance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. ospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the 5FF(b))			
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act (30 U.S.C. 923)				
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, a amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widow Act, as amended. (42 U.S.	ws or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security S.C. 405(g))			
864	SSID	All claims for supplement Act, as amended.	tal security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security			
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (U.S.C. (g))	(old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of California

Plaintiff

v. Dallas County Texas
see attached

Defendant

Plaintiff

Defendant

Civil Action No. SACV10-1692 JVS(AGR)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,

whose name and address are:

BARBARA JEANNE ALTEMEIER 13861 YOCKEY STREET GARDEN GROVE, CA 92844-2663

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

	Nou		C	CLERK OF COURT	
Date:	NOV - 4 2010	OFFICE	USE	Signature of Clerk or De	puty Clerk SEAL

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for (nan	ne of individual and title, if any)							
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·							
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at (pa	lace)						
	•	u.	on (date)	; or					
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)								
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,								
	on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or								
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)		, who is					
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)								
			on (date)						
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because		; or					
	☐ Other (specify):								
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00					
Deter	I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.								
Date:			Server's signature						
			Printed name and title						
			Server's address						

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 3:10-cv-02646-N -BK Document 1 Filed 11/04/10 Page 39 of 39 PageID 39